ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P Roman M. Silberfeld, Bar No. 62783	
RMSilberfeld@rkmc.com	
David Martinez, Bar No. 193183 DMartinez@rkmc.com	
2049 Century Park East, Suite 3400	
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208 Telephone: 310-552-0130	
Telephone: 310-552-0130 Facsimile: 310-229-5800	
ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P	
Laura E. Nelson, Bar No. 231856 LENelson@rkmc.com	
800 LaSalle Avenue 2800 LaSalle Plaza	
Minneapolis, MN 55402	
Telephone: 612-349-8500 Facsimile: 612-339-4181	
Attorneys For Plaintiffs Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Enterprise Services	
Purchasing LLC; Best Buy Enterprise Services, Best Buy Stores, L.P.; Bestbuy.com, L.L.C.; and	
Magnolia Hi-Fi, Inc.	
[Additional Counsel Listed On Signature Pag	e]
UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCIS	SCO DIVISION
IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL)	Master File No. 07-MD-1827 SI
IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. 07-MD-1827 SI MDL No. 1827
ANTITRUST LITIGATION	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases:
IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To:	MDL No. 1827
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al,	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572,	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al,	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572, Best Buy v. Toshiba Corp. et al,	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945 AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTIONS
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572, Best Buy v. Toshiba Corp. et al, Case No. 12-CV-4114 Eastman Kodak Company v. Epson Imaging Devices Corp. et al.,	MDL No. 1827 Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945 AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTIONS
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572, Best Buy v. Toshiba Corp. et al, Case No. 12-CV-4114 Eastman Kodak Company v. Epson Imaging Devices Corp. et al., Case No. 10-CV-5452	Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945 AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTIONS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINE NO. 10) Date: July 9, 2013
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572, Best Buy v. Toshiba Corp. et al, Case No. 12-CV-4114 Eastman Kodak Company v. Epson Imaging Devices Corp. et al.,	Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945 AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTIONS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINE NO. 10)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Documents Relates To: Best Buy v. AU Optronics Corp. et al, Case No. 10-CV-4572, Best Buy v. Toshiba Corp. et al, Case No. 12-CV-4114 Eastman Kodak Company v. Epson Imaging Devices Corp. et al., Case No. 10-CV-5452 Target Corp., et. al., v. AU Optronics Corp. et	Individual Cases: Case No. 10-CV-4572 Case No. 12-CV-4114 Case No. 10-CV-5452 Case No. 10-CV-4945 AMENDED NOTICE OF MOTIONS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINE NO. 10) Date: July 9, 2013 Time: 10:00 a.m.

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: 2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on July 9, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., before the Honorable 3 Susan Y. Illston, United States District Judge of the Northern District of California, San Francisco 4 Division, located in Courtroom 10, 19th Floor, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, the Track 1B Plaintiffs¹ ("Plaintiffs") will and hereby do move the Court for an order 5 granting a motion in limine exclude references to, and evidence of the ability of Plaintiffs to seek 6 7 treble damages and attorneys' fees and costs. 8 This motion is based on this amended notice, supporting memorandum of points and 9 authorities, and the other records, papers, and orders in this action, as well as such additional 10 evidence and arguments as may be presented by the parties before or at the hearing. 11 Respectfully submitted this 1st day of July, 2013. 12 /s/ Roman M. Silberfeld Roman M. Silberfeld, Bar No. 62783 13 David Martinez, Bar No. 193183 ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P. 14 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3400 Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208 15 Telephone: 310-552-0130 Facsimile: 310-229-5800 16 Email: RMSilberfeld@rkmc.com DMartinez@rkmc.com 17 Laura E. Nelson, Bar No. 231856 18 ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P. 800 LaSalle Avenue 19 2800 LaSalle Plaza Minneapolis, MN 55402 20 Telephone: 612-349-8500 Facsimile: 612-339-4181 21 Email: LENelson@rkmc.com 22 Attorneys For Plaintiffs Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy Purchasing LLC; Best Buy Enterprise 23 Services, Inc.; Best Buy Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.com, LLC; and Magnolia Hi-Fi, Inc. 24 25 26 ¹ The Track 1B Plaintiffs are the Best Buy Plaintiffs, Target Corporation, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 27 Kmart Corp., RadioShack Corp., Old Comp, Inc., Newegg, Inc., Good Guys Inc., and Eastman Kodak Company.

Plaintiffs' Amended Motion In Limine No. 10

28

83947821.6

Master File No. M07-1827 SI

1	/s/ Janet I. Levine
2	Jason C. Murray (CA Bar No. 169806) Janet I. Levine (CA Bar No. 94255)
3	CROWELL & MORING LLP
3	515 South Flower St., 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071
4	Telephone: 213-622-4750 Facsimile: 213-622-2690
5	Email: jmurray@crowell.com
6	jlevine@crowell.com
7	Jeffrey H. Howard (pro hac vice)
	Jerome A. Murphy (pro hac vice) Matthew J. McBurney (pro hac vice)
8	CROWELL & MORING LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
9	Washington, D.C. 20004
10	Telephone: 202-624-2500 Facsimile: 202-628-5116
	Email: jhoward@crowell.com
11	jmurphy@crowell.com mmcburney@crowell.com
12	·
13	Kenneth L. Adams (pro hac vice) R. Bruce Holcomb (pro hac vice)
14	Christopher T. Leonardo (pro hac vice) ADAMS HOLCOMB LLP
	1875 Eye Street NW
15	Washington, DC 20006 Telephone: 202-580-8822
16	Facsimile: 202-580-8821
17	Email: adams@adamsholcomb.com holcomb@adamsholcomb.com
18	leonardo@adamsholcomb.com
	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Target Corporation; Sears,
19	Roebuck & Co.; Kmart Corp.; RadioShack Corp., Old Comp, Inc.; Newegg, Inc., and Good Guys
20	Inc.
21	/s/ Karl D. Belgum
22	Karl D. Belgum (State Bar No. 122752) John R. Foote (State Bar No. 99674)
23	Blaire Z. Russell (State Bar No. 271693) NIXON PEABODY LLP
	One Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor
24	San Francisco, CA 94111-3600 Telephone: 415- 984-8200
25	Facsimile: 415-984-8300
26	Email: kbelgum@nixonpeabody.com jfoote@nixonpeabody.com
27	brussell@nixonpeabody.com
	Attorneys for Plaintiff Eastman Kodak Company
28	

83947821.6

PRIOR RELEVANT COURT ORDERS Pursuant to the Court's Order of April 9, 2012 (MDL Dkt. No. 5430), Plaintiffs identify the following relevant orders: In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation, No. M 07-1827 SI (Relating to All Direct-Purchaser Plaintiff Class Actions), Final Pretrial Scheduling Order (MDL Dkt. No. 5597, May 4, 2012).

I.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 10 (filed on June 18, 2013) is hereby amended to reflect that Plaintiff Kmart will not be seeking treble damages with respect to its Michigan state law claim, thus making any reference to trebling under federal or state law unnecessary and prejudicial. Kmart has offered to enter into a stipulation with Defendants on this point, which based on the controlling case law in this Circuit, removes the only potential basis to oppose this Motion. But Defendants have asserted, without explanation or authority, that even if Kmart waives its claim for treble damages under Michigan law, they intend to oppose the Motion. Plaintiffs are therefore compelled to file an amended motion in limine to clarify the issue for the Court.

10. Motion to Exclude References to, And Evidence of the Ability of Plaintiffs to Seek Treble Damages And Attorneys' Fees And Costs.

Plaintiffs move to exclude introduction of any evidence at trial regarding Plaintiffs' ability to recover treble damages or attorneys' fees and costs. Such evidence is irrelevant, would improperly interfere with the jury's fact-finding role, and would unfairly prejudice the Plaintiffs.² Plaintiffs' entitlement to treble damages is inadmissible in a jury trial. See, e.g., Brooks v. Cook, 938 F.2d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 1991) ("An instruction informing the jury of the trebling provision 'is an invitation to the jury to negate Congress' determination that actual damages should be trebled in order to deter antitrust violations and encourage private enforcement of the antitrust laws.'") (citation omitted); In re Tableware Antitrust Litig., No. C-04-3514 VRW, 2007 WL 781960, at *3 (N.D. Cal. March 13, 2007) ("In antitrust actions, 'courts have uniformly concluded that mentioning treble damages and attorney fees to the jury is improper.'") (quoting HBE Leasing Corp. v. Frank, 22 F.3d 41 (2d Cir. 1994)) (internal brackets omitted); In re Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litig., No. 07-md-1819 CW (N.D. Cal.) (Dec. 16,

² In an effort to streamline the presentation of evidence at trial, Plaintiff Kmart will not seek discretionary trebling for its Michigan state law damages, thus obviating the need to establish at trial that Defendants' violations are "flagrant" pursuant to Mich. Comp. Laws. Ann. 445.778.

Case 3:12-cv-04114-SI Document 170 Filed 07/02/13 Page 6 of 8 1 2010), Order on Motions In Limine and for Pre-Trial Preparation, at *6 (Dkt. No. 1206) ("SRAM 2 MIL Order"). 3 Likewise, the jury should not be informed of Plaintiffs' potential right to receive attorneys' fees. 4 See Brooks, 938 F.2d at 1048 ("[i]n a case where the plaintiff is entitled to compensatory 5 damages, informing the jury of the plaintiff's potential right to receive attorneys' fees might lead 6 the jury to offset the fees by reducing the damage award."); HBE Leasing Corp. v. Frank, 22 F.3d 7 41, 45-46 (2d Cir. 1994) (collecting case law and holding "[i]n that context [of antitrust 8 violations] as well, courts have uniformly concluded that mentioning treble damages and 9 attorneys' fees to the jury is improper."). 10 In the DPP Class Action Case, this Court granted a similar motion. Order dated 5/4/12 (Dkt. No. 11 5597, p. 4, No. 1). 12 /// 13 /// 14 /// 15 /// 16 /// 17 /// 18 /// 19 /// 20 /// 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28

Plaintiffs' Amended Motion In Limine No. 10

Master File No. M07-1827 SI

Case 3:12-cv-04114-SI Document 170 Filed 07/02/13 Page 8 of 8 1 Washington, D.C. 20004 2 Telephone: 202-624-2500 Facsimile: 202-628-5116 3 Email: jhoward@crowell.com jmurphy@crowell.com 4 mmcburney@crowell.com 5 Kenneth L. Adams (pro hac vice) R. Bruce Holcomb (pro hac vice) 6 Christopher T. Leonardo (pro hac vice) ADAMS HOLCOMB LLP 7 1875 Eye Street NW Washington, DC 20006 8 Telephone: 202-580-8822 Facsimile: 202-580-8821 9 Email: adams@adamsholcomb.com holcomb@adamsholcomb.com 10 leonardo@adamsholcomb.com 11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Target Corporation; Sears, Roebuck & Co; Kmart Corp.; RadioShack 12 Corp., Old Comp, Inc.; Newegg, Inc., and Good Guys Inc. 13 /s/ Karl D. Belgum 14 Karl D. Belgum (State Bar No. 122752) John R. Foote (State Bar No. 99674) 15 Blaire Z. Russell (State Bar No. 271693) NIXON PEABODY LLP 16 One Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3600 17 Telephone: (415) 984-8200 Facsimile: (415) 984-8300 18 Email: kbelgum@nixonpeabody.com ifoote@nixonpeabody.com 19 brussell@nixonpeabody.com 20 Attorneys for Plaintiff Eastman Kodak Company 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28